

REMARKS

I. Status

The Office Action indicates claims 1-6, 8-37, and 39-62 to be pending in this Application.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 32-35, 37, 39, 41, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,810), Bain (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,715), and Mock (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0041849).

Claims 5 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and Kaars (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059384).

Claims 9 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and Reed (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,325).

Claims 11 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and Dillon (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,561).

Claims 12 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and Reed.

Claims 13, 14, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and McKinley (U.S. Patent No. 4,926,326).

Claims 16 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and Wong (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,115).

Claims 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 30, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and Lagimonier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041265).

Claims 19 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Skladman, Bain, Mock, Lagimonier, and Kaars.

Claims 21 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, Lagimonier, and Reed.

Claims 23 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, Lagimonier, and Reed.

Claims 25 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, Lagimonier, and Dillon.

Claims 26 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, Lagimonier, and Reed.

Claims 27, 28, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, Lagimonier, and McKinley.

Claims 31 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, Lagimonier, and Wong.

Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 are independent.

II. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, and Mock, and rejects claims 17 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, Mock, and Lagimonier.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... providing to said user, in accordance with one or more specified criteria, a moving display of one or more notifications ...; [and]

providing to said user a non-moving display of one or more of the notifications ...”

as set forth in each of claims 1 and 32 (emphasis added).

As another example, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... providing to said user a moving display of one or more notifications ...; and

providing to said user a non-moving display of one or more of the notifications”

as set forth in each of claims 17 and 48 (emphasis added).

The Office Action apparently contends that Mock teaches a moving display and that Bain teaches a non-moving display.

However, even if, for the sake of argument, Mock and Bain are taken to so teach, Applicants believe it clear that such would not at all be disclosure, teaching, or suggestion, for instance, of non-moving display of notifications that had previously been moving.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 17, 32, and 48, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

III. Dependent Claim Rejections

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

(Continued on next page)

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4139.

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:



Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Dated: October 1, 2007

Mailing Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)